

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 14-22, and 26-33 have been withdrawn. Claims 12, 13, and 23-25 have not been amended herein, and claims 10-11 have been amended herein.

On the summary page of the present office Action, the Examiner indicated that the drawings filed on March 13, 2001 were objected to. Accompanying this Amendment is a Replacement Sheet for each Figure. Such Replacement Sheets are believed to overcome the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner appears to reject claim 10 under 35 USC 112. In explaining this matter, the Examiner stated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase "the product" in the third sentence of claim 10. Claim 10 as presented herein is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 10-13, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perkowski (6,961,712).

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

"in response to the request, sending an information code and information relating to the first and/or second computer to a third computer on the network, the information code being associated with one or more characteristics of the product,

determining whether the second computer is authorized to receive from the third computer a respective value for each of the one or more characteristics,

sending from the third computer to the second computer the respective value of each characteristic associated with the information code which was determined to be authorized, and not sending from the third

computer to the second computer the respective value of each characteristic associated with the information code which was determined not to be authorized, and

sending the respective value of each authorized characteristic from the second computer to the first computer." (Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 10, the Examiner appears to rely on the abstract and Figure 2A of Perkowski for disclosing the features of claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Perkowski (hereinafter, merely "Perkowski") do not appear to specifically disclose the above identified features of claim 10. That is, Perkowski does not appear to disclose "determining whether the second computer is authorized to receive from the third computer a respective value for each of the one or more characteristics" and "sending from the third computer to the second computer the respective value of each characteristic associated with the information code which was determined to be authorized, and not sending from the third computer to the second computer the respective value of each characteristic associated with the information code which was determined not to be authorized", as in claim 10.

Accordingly, in the method of claim 10, the third computer may send to the second computer a "value" of a characteristic only if it is authorized to receive the same. As an example, and described in paragraph 0031 of the present application, if three values are available from the third computer (which may be manufacturer server 71) (e.g., picture, specification, and wholesale price), and if the second computer (which may be dealer server 70) is authorized to receive only the picture and the specification, the third computer (or manufacturer server) may only send the specification and picture

to the second computer and may not send the wholesale price to the second computer.

Claims 11-13 and 23-25 are dependent from independent claim 10. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 11-13 and 23-25 are distinguishable from Perkowski for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid  
Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants